

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ON NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY I		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/064,666	08/05/2002	George E. Kim	MOG-02/US 5341		
23508	7590 04/10/2003				
LUNDEEN & DICKINSON, LLP			EXAMINER .		
PO BOX 131 HOUSTON,	144 ГХ 77219-1144	LE, HOA T			
	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1773		
			DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					7				
Office Action Summary		Application N .		Applicant(s)	/				
		10/064,666		KIM ET AL.					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		H. T. Le		1773					
The MAILING DATE f this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status									
1)[	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•							
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non-fina	al.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
<b>4)</b> ⊠	Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application								
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-11,21-24 and 27</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.									
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.									
·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12-20</u> is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.									
	Claims are subject to restriction and/or	election requirem	ent.						
Application Papers									
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	J						
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to	o by the Examiner	•						
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.									
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.									
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119									
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).									
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:									
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been receiv	ed.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been receiv	ed in Applicatio	on No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).									
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).									
Attachment(s)									
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)									
16) 🔲 Notic	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	19) 🔲		Patent Application (I					

## DETAILED ACTION

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Claims 1, 2 and 22, drawn to spherical agglomerates, classified in class
     423, subclass 610.
  - II. Claims 3-8 and 23, drawn to coated titanium substrate, classified in class 428, subclass 323.
  - III. Claims 9-11 and 24, drawn to coating method, classified in class 427, subclass 212.
  - III. Claims12-20, 25 and 26, drawn to a ball valve, classified in class 251, subclass 315.03
  - IV. Claims 21 and 27, drawn to an apparatus, classified in class 239, subclass 650.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as active ingredients in cosmetic products (e.g. sunscreen) and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be

obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 3. Invention I and inventions III-V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product such as the agglomerates of titania as the main ingredient in sunscreen product.
- 4. Inventions II and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the coating process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product such as a manganese oxide-coated steel substrate.

- 5. Inventions II and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention II has separate utility such as an automobile painted with a coating composition containing titania as pigments. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 6. Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation: the system of invention V cannot comprise the substrate of invention II and the coated substrate of invention II cannot disperse agglomerates as the system of invention V.
- 7. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 8. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Daniel Lundeen on April 1, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of invention IV, claims 12-20, 25 and 26. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-11, 21-24 and 27 are withdrawn from

further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention.

9. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

## Specification

10. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the following descriptions in the specification are queried because they don't seem to fit the context they are in.

Page 6, last line of paragraph [0022]: "TiO2-20Ta2O5 and TiO2-45ZrO2".

Page 8, paragraph [0028]: "400 500 amps", "36 48 SLPM", "7 12 SLPM", "50 80 mm", "36 60 g/min", "125 500 microns"

Page 10, paragraph [0034]: "26 36 microns", "5 45 microns", "36 60 g/min"

Page 11, paragraph [0037] and [0038]: "30 35 weight percent"

Page 12, paragraph [0042], please explain hardness unit "HV<sub>0.3</sub>"

Appropriate correction is required.

- 11. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
- 12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of 37 CFR 1.71(a)-(c):

- (a) The specification must include a written description of the invention or discovery and of the manner and process of making and using the same, and is required to be in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which the invention or discovery appertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.
- (b) The specification must set forth the precise invention for which a patent is solicited, in such manner as to distinguish it from other inventions and from what is old. It must describe completely a specific embodiment of the process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or improvement invented, and must explain the mode of operation or principle whenever applicable. The best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention must be set forth.
- (c) In the case of an improvement, the specification must particularly point out the part or parts of the process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter to which the improvement relates, and the description should be confined to the specific improvement and to such parts as necessarily cooperate with it or as may be necessary to a complete understanding or description of it.

The specification is objected to under 37 CFR 1.71 because the specification fails to provide clear and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and/or use of the claimed invention. At page 3, paragraph [0007], "ultrafine" is defined as materials having a dimension of less than "300 nm". However, at page 5, line 10, and in claims (namely claim 17), it is stated that the ultrafine titania "preferably has a grain size less than 500 nm". Such discrepancy in the specification

Application No. 10/064,666

Art Unit 1773

fails to provide clear and exact terms as such to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention.

13. Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention as set forth in the objection to the specification above.

14. References are cited as art of interest.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to H. T. Le whose telephone number is 703-308-2415. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Mondays to Friday.

H. T. Le

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1773

hl

April 6, 2003